Welcome To...
The Fifth National Wraparound Initiative Advisors Meeting

Nashville, TN
July 15-16, 2008
Goals for our meeting

• Review progress and accomplishments by the NWI and its task groups
• Solicit feedback and input on works in progress
• Review and discuss feedback on the priorities and future direction(s) of the NWI
• Work in small task-oriented groups to set action plans for task groups and priority activities
Today's Agenda

• Introductions
• Recap of the year
• Reports from workgroups
  - Wraparound Family Partner Task Force
  - Standards workgroup
  - Youth workgroup
  - Research and evaluation workgroup
• BREAK
• Review of needs sensing around priority activities of the NWI
• Small group work on how to undertake the priority activities
Tomorrow’s Agenda

• Reflections on day 1 and the NWI’s future
• Panel and discussion:
  – Priorities for the NWI
• Task groups and continuation of yesterday’s small group work
• BREAK
• Report out
• Summary of discussions about goals and priorities for next year and beyond!
• Next steps and wrap-up
Looking back:
A quick recap of our initial goals and recent activities
Looking back: “Our goals,” 2003

Describe successful practice and implementation in a way that is “generic” enough to accommodate the variety of successful approaches.

Synthesize
- Accumulated expertise +
- Existing theory and research evidence +
- New theory and research

Develop useful information and tools
Develop the research base
Goal statement from the 2003 meeting

- To bring together into a learning and sharing community individuals with expertise in Wraparound so we can speak to the world with a common language, to reduce confusion and promote understanding about the components of and benefits of wraparound.
How to do this?

Engage stakeholders
- People with diverse perspectives
- People who have worked with successful teams or programs

Open membership

Use work groups for specific products

Consensus-building
- Transparent process—web-based
- Ratings and comments on tools
- Posting of drafts to build consensus
The “Ten Principles” document
   - Offers a description about what these abstract principles might mean in practice
   - Highlights important areas of concern

The “Phases and Activities”
   - Model is a “skeleton” that can be “fleshed out” to be unique to a community
   - Distinct from any existing manual; however no completely novel activities

The “Necessary Support Conditions”
More recent products (2005-2007)

- Compendium of tools, strategies, and techniques for wraparound
- Consultants page and tips for using consultants
- Measure of System Support - the Community Supports for Wraparound Inventory
- Article on the NWI: “Building on Practice-Based Evidence” (Psychiatric Services, October 2006)
- Brief summary of published studies and a listing of endorsements of wraparound as a promising, best, or evidence-based practice
Recap of the past year

- The Role of the Family Partner in Accomplishing the 10 Principles
- Why, and How, Does Wraparound Work: A Theory of Change
- Chapter for the System of Care Handbook (Stroul & Blau, now available!)
- Wraparound evidence reviews (in several formats) plus additional presentations and publications
Recap of the past year

- Revisiting and revising the wraparound principle of *Persistence / Unconditional Care*
- Completion of 10-year follow-up to the *State Wraparound Survey*
- Meeting of the Standards Workgroup of the NWI, Red Rocks, CO
  - Proposal for an *Implementation Guide to Wraparound*
- Completion of the *Resource Guide to Wraparound*
Revisiting and revising the principle of Persistence / Unconditional

Choose the option that best reflects your views about the proposed changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of NWI advisors selecting the option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prefer new version of &quot;Unconditional&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer previous version of &quot;Persistence&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither version is clearly better</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Revisiting and Revising the principle of Persistence / Unconditional

- From open-ended feedback, little disagreement with the content of the descriptions of either principle.
  - Advisors’ endorse both the notion of unconditional care and the reality that systems are often not set up to provide care that is fully unconditional.

- The debate centered on the value-based title Unconditional vs the more practical or applied version expressed by the title Persistent

- Feedback was used to try to make the description of the principle as clear as possible in both of these areas and post a revision of the definition under the heading of Unconditional Care.
• Has its own website within the NWI website
• Accessible from NWI main page
• Also accessible from the easy-to-remember wrapinfo.org
1. Introduction and Basics.
   Introduction to and history of wraparound, the National Wraparound Initiative and the Resource Guide.

2. The Principles of Wraparound
   A description of the values that underlie wraparound and examples of what these values look like in practice.

3. Theory and Research
   A focus on key questions such as Why is wraparound expected to produce positive outcomes? What is the evidence of wraparound’s effectiveness? and How widely implemented is wraparound?

4. Wraparound Practice
   The NWI’s description of the phases and activities that make up the wraparound process, and descriptions of key roles in carrying out the process.

5. Supporting Wraparound Implementation
   A series of articles focusing on what organizations and communities need to provide to support and sustain wraparound: coaching and training, finance, accountability structures, data systems, and more.
More progress from the past year...

- Family partner task force
- Standards workgroup
- Youth Task Force
- Research and evaluation workgroup
Family Partner Task Force of the NWI

Report at NWI Advisors Meeting
July 15, 2008
Standards Workgroup of the NWI

Report at NWI Advisors Meeting
July 15, 2008
Research and Evaluation Activities of the NWI

Report at NWI Advisors Meeting
July 15, 2008
Research and Evaluation: priorities from 2006-2007

• Move community supports measure forward
• Continue to conduct and publish process and outcomes research
• New reviews – published research but also evaluation reports and stories from communities
• Develop an evaluation consortium
• Complete outcomes reviews for publication
• Conduct an implementation research review
• Propose/Conduct multiple case study projects that allow in-depth examination of wraparound practice
Research activities, 2007-2008

• *Community Supports for Wraparound Inventory*
• Two new reviews of wraparound evidence base
• Review of wraparound implementation research
• State Wraparound Survey completed
CSWI

• The 42 items are grouped within 6 themes:
  1. Community partnership
  2. Collaborative action
  3. Fiscal policies and sustainability
  4. Service array
  5. Human resource development, and
  6. Accountability

• Respondents complete the 42 items by rating the development of supports in their community or program on a 5 point scale
  - 0 = “least developed” and 4 = “fully developed”
CSWI: Pilot test

- Seven communities in different states, rural, urban and small city with environs
- Very strong interrater reliability: Mean average intraclass correlation = .78
- Strong factor structure that followed the themes, excellent internal reliability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's alpha</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theme 1</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 2</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 3</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 4</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 5</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 6</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entire CSWI</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CSWI Total Scores
(Maximum possible = 160)
Sample Site Feedback: Themes

**Theme Means: Site and National Comparison**

- **Theme 1:** Community Partnerships
- **Theme 2:** Collaborative Action
- **Theme 3:** Fiscal Policies and Sustainability
- **Theme 4:** Availability of Services and Supports
- **Theme 5:** Human Resource Development
- **Theme 6:** Accountability

The diagram compares site means and national comparison means for each theme, with a scale ranging from least developed to fully developed.
Sample Site Feedback: Theme 1

1.1: Community Team

1.2: Empowered Community Team

1.3: Family Voice

1.4: Youth Voice

1.5: Agency Support

1.6: Community Stakeholders

1.7: Community Representativeness

Theme 1: Site and National Item Means
Sample Site Feedback: Theme 1

Theme 1: Site and National Item Means

1.1: Community Team
1.2: Empowered Community Team
1.3: Family Voice
1.4: Youth Voice
1.5: Agency Support
1.6: Community Stakeholders
1.7: Community Representativeness

NWI Mean
Site 7 Mean

Least Developed  |  Midway  |  Fully Developed

0  |  1  |  2  |  3  |  4
Reviews of wraparound evidence base

Theory and Research: Chapter 3.3
A Narrative Review of Wraparound Outcome Studies

Theory and Research: Chapter 3.2
The Evidence Base and Wraparound
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## Suter & Bruns: Meta-Analysis of Controlled Studies of Wraparound

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Target population</th>
<th>Control Group Design</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Bickman et al. (2003)</td>
<td>Mental health</td>
<td>Non-equivalent comparison</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Carney et al. (2003)</td>
<td>Juvenile justice</td>
<td>Randomized control</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Evans et al. (1998)</td>
<td>Mental health</td>
<td>Randomized control</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Hyde et al. (1996)</td>
<td>Mental health</td>
<td>Non-equivalent comparison</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Pullman et al. (2006)</td>
<td>Juvenile justice</td>
<td>Historical comparison</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Study Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Characteristic</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randomized controlled trial</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non randomized comparison</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year of publication</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990s</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000s</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em><em>Publication type (N = 15</em>)</em>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal article</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book chapter</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper presentations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal reports</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuscript</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child welfare</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile justice</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental health</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: *Four studies presented findings in more than one outlet.*
Mean Effect Sizes & 95% Confidence Intervals

- Large = 0.80
- Medium = 0.50
- Small = 0.20

Outcome Domains:
- Combined Domains
- Living Situation
- Mental Health Outcomes
- School Functioning
- Community Functioning

Effect Sizes:
- Mean ES
- Mean ES w/o imputation
Important Notes

• All studies compared youth receiving wraparound to those receiving treatment as usual, as opposed to no-treatment.

• Mean effect sizes of all published controlled studies on wraparound ($N = 7$)
  – Many studies published before efforts to fully specify or describe the wraparound model.
  – Majority of these studies did not report how fully the wraparound model was implemented.
  – Only one study measured fidelity.
  – One study reported “there is no evidence that the content or the quality of the services were different for the Wraparound children” [versus the comparison group] (Bickman et al., 2003; p.151).
State Wraparound Survey completed!

Theory and Research: Chapter 3.4

National Trends in Implementing Wraparound: Results from the State Wraparound Survey, 2007

Eric J. Bruns, Co-Director
National Wraparound Initiative
April Sather, Research Coordinator
Wraparound Evaluation & Research Team
Leyla Stambaugh, Research Psychologist
RTI International
State Wraparound Survey: Number of Programs & Youth Served

• 87.8% (n = 43) reported having some sort of wraparound program
  - Same as for 1998 survey
• Of the 43 states reporting a wraparound initiative, 42 gave estimates of the number of children served statewide
  - An estimated 98,293 children estimated to be served by wraparound, in a reported 819 unique programs across the United States
State Wraparound Survey: Positive trends?

• Greater number of agencies involved in wraparound implementation
• Greater diversity of child-serving systems taking a lead role
  – Child welfare, juvenile justice, and education
• Increasing availability of in-state resources for training and professional development
• More consistent measurement of fidelity
• More formal evaluation of wraparound
State Wraparound Survey: Implications

- Wraparound is reported to be widely implemented – twice as prevalent as other intensive community treatment models combined
  - MST: 19,000 annually*
  - FFT: 30,000 annually*
  - MTFC: 1,000 annually*

*Source = Evidence Based Associates (2008)
Conclusion: Meeting the need
Each symbol = 10,000 youths with SED in U.S.

Estimated to receive WA, MST, FFT, MTFC
Other research-related News

- Randomized study of wraparound compared to traditional case management continues in Nevada
  - N=71 youth referred and now being followed
- Wraparound Fidelity Assessment System
  - Pilot testing of tools, survey of users
  - Online data entry and reporting system (WONDERS) now available for collaborators
- Publications
- What else should we know about?
Results of WFAS quality improvement surveying

Mean rating (1-5) and percent agreeing at least “somewhat” (i.e., rating of 3 or higher out of 5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Captures strengths and weaknesses</th>
<th>Feasible for implementation</th>
<th>Site benefited from use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WFI-4</td>
<td>4.2 (100%)</td>
<td>3.8 (88%)</td>
<td>4.0 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOM</td>
<td>4.2 (100%)</td>
<td>4.0 (100%)</td>
<td>4.0 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRM</td>
<td>3.5 (80%)</td>
<td>2.5 (50%)</td>
<td>2.5 (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSWI</td>
<td>4.3 (100%)</td>
<td>4.0 (88%)</td>
<td>3.7 (88%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Priorities activities for the future of the NWI
NWI Priorities for the future
- Ideas included in the survey

• Hold conferences
• Oversee credentialing process for individual staff
• Oversee certification process for organizations/programs
• Develop and disseminate description of essential staff skill sets
• Develop expectations for - and tools to support - supervision of staff in key roles
• Develop a more extensive and interactive community of practice
• Develop a process for assessing the quality and/or impact of training and technical assistance
Priorities for the Future Survey: Respondent Characteristics

- 99 Respondents
- Have you and/or your close family members ever received intensive services/interventions (wraparound or otherwise) from service systems (e.g., mental health, child welfare, juvenile justice, special education, etc.)? **44% YES**

- Role
  - Supervisor/Administrator 23%
  - Manager/Administrator/Policy Maker (authority over several programs) 21%
  - “Other” 21%
  - Wraparound trainer 14%
  - Wraparound staff 11%
  - Researcher/Evaluator 5%
People have suggested that the NWI should hold conferences. If it were DONE RIGHT (see next question), do you think it would be a good idea for the NWI to host conferences?
Conferences: What would it take to “do it right” (& other comments)

- Basic ideas:
  - An inspirational format that would also be a place to work on skill development at multiple levels
  - Start fairly simple and build in subsequent years
  - Utilize intensive workshops and panel discussions
  - Invitational conference with members of the NWI - Feature programs that work well and truly follow national NWI standards of practice
  - Maybe regional conferences so folks could drive

- More detailed ideas
  - Present detailed information about model programs, infrastructure development, organizational readiness, fidelity monitoring strategies, evaluation activities, partnering with family organizations, etc
  - More focus on the family/youth taking a leadership role in the wraparound process. Demonstrations of family members/youth successfully facilitating their teams.
  - Establish a core framework for wraparound practice and skillbuilding in each area
  - Multiple tracks, e.g., certifications in facilitation/coaching/supervision, and Workshops in finance, management information systems and governance structures.
  - I would like to see a conference that was structured like technical assistance. Tracts could be established around themes, such as the phases; or implementation challenges (community development; funding; sustainability; evaluating effectiveness, youth and family ownership
  - Regional training in wraparound, with a mechanism for follow along training and support
Conferences: What would it take to “do it right” (& other comments)

- **Alternatives**
  - Dissemination of information like "infomercials" white papers, etc...
  - Web-based conferences that are truly interactive might be a strategy for allowing folks to share expertise and solve problems together as well as to offer some follow up support and encourage after presenting elementary training on NWI materials.
  - There are many training resources for workforce development i.e. "Facilitator", "Coach", "Family Support Person" - focus on teaching administrators / leaders to prepare the soil for effect wraparound.
  - Perhaps the way to start would be to expand on the current connection to the training institutes (or either of the RTC conferences), by offering a conference-within-a-conference
  - Sponsor several forums where issues related to the implementation can be addressed in a structured format, ie, funding, dissemination, education and the like
  - Options already out there. Why would the NWI compete with the national conferences that already exist?
Certification for Individuals

People have suggested that the NWI should develop--and then oversee--national certification processes for key roles in wraparound (e.g. facilitator or family partner). Do you think it would be a good idea for the NWI to do this?
Certification for Individuals

- Ideas on how
  - Need to base on core skills for key roles, allowing for different processes within wraparound and an idea of how to measure for these competences. I also think there should be some training available on the web to achieve these competencies.
  - It would need to be mobile, relatively inexpensive, and include follow up support.
  - Ensure that the certification process is affordable for both the public and private sector. Prioritize training locally based professionals to take over the certification process in their organization or local community.
  - This certification process would need to be multi-tiered so that individuals could move up or horizontally in the job ladder.
  - It would have to be like a COA certification process and be totally separate from paid trainers like me. It would also have to have a separate active board. I go back and forth on whether it's a good idea, but if we don't do it, someone else will.
  - I think we need not only certification but also college-level courses on high-quality wraparound and building systems of care.
  - Would have to be flexible enough to fit into local community and agency structures.
Certification for Individuals

• Concerns
  - I agree that the one thing that could be jeopardized most is the creativity in which the role of facilitator can use to achieve goals/outcomes. However, it is also the role that makes the most sense to certify given its importance to the wraparound process.
  - I would worry that this would run the risk of becoming too prescriptive and would decrease community/system creativity and put more emphasis on process rather than outcome.
  - NO, NO, NO!!! Please allow supervisors to make their own assessments about the competency of front line staff.
  - I marked "bad idea" because may result in forcing providers into working with certain training entities

• Alternative ideas
  - I would prefer the NWI help agencies develop a format (job descriptions, processes) that would help them certify their own facilitators or family partners.
  - I think to design a framework for states or entities that want to develop a certification for wraparound what would be key criteria to consider
  - I think that needs to done at the local level by Supervisors/trainers who are "recognized" by the NWI as certified Supervisors/Coaches
  - Not a set of rules but a set of guides that determine key issues, implementation options, and lessons learned from multiple sites.
People have suggested that the NWI should develop --and then oversee-- certification for agencies/programs that provide wraparound. This would be something like standards. Do you think it would be a good idea for the NWI to do this?
Certifying Organizations

Ideas on how

- I think this is of critical importance. In our state, one of the issues for many years was that everyone said they were practicing Wraparound. The challenge with this is (1) developing standards. In my view we are still in the early stages of learning what the "state of the art" is.
- Families and youth who have experienced Wraparound must be involved in any certification process.
- The costs have to be passed on to the agencies seeking said credential/certification. It is a huge undertaking, but one that I think must be pursued.
- It would be easier & probably more flexible for whole agencies to pursue certification rather than individual staff.
- Actual site visits to determine quality of effort and that people can access the programs.
- Base it on the major domains of wraparound programs allowing sites to be then critiqued based on the domains, and not necessarily a step by step approach to wraparound.
- Agencies would have to go through a process to make sure that they had systems, procedures, and policies in place that are consistent with standards. Basic requirements need to be met. Basic fidelity needs to be shown. Cost to agency minimal.
- Requiring contracting agencies to be certified would raise the bar for all of wraparound but wouldn’t lower practices for agencies doing more than required.
- Agencies could demonstrate their training/certification/coaching process to the NWI. Share training materials, work docs (SNCVD, wrap plans, skill sets being used etc.)
Certifying Organizations

Concerns

- Certification should be based on the effectiveness of wraparound - measurement that looks at outcomes, not processes
- Even though I feel this may be a good idea, it can become "prescriptive" or feel "mandated", which lends itself to the potential for being a less organic process
- This would be a large undertaking for NWI. Agency certification would involve a re-certification process (reviewing every 2 years or something), auditing, etc
- I see no authority or powerbase for this activity. We could just "make it up" and hope that social forces lend credibility and authority but seems like a not great direction
- There has been insufficient systematic attention to key components of implementation, let alone to be able to focus on the unique differences in each setting
- NO, NO, NO!!! Our field is in its infancy. Please do not discourage practitioners from engaging in creative practice for fear of being told they're not "doing it right". NWI has done a good job of defining best practice. Now, we hope the best minds in our field will innovate

Alternative ideas

- A supportive and respectful technical assistance and certification process rather than a "pass-fail" certification,
- If it was something offered by NWI, value might be added in that there may be less of a conflict of interest -- it could be a cleaner process.
- We would need to guarantee that certification would lead to positive outcomes.
- I see having "standards" and doing oversight as two entirely different things. I see NWI in educational and support capacities, not as an "oversight" body.
- It's the word certification. I'd rather it be an association that one can choose be part of. The role of the association would be to provide services and supports that cause agencies and programs to want to be a member of the association. NWI role should be more about tools and knowledge sharing.
Descriptions of Skills

People have suggested that the NWI should develop descriptions of essential skills for key roles in the wraparound process. Do you think it would be a good idea for the NWI to do this?
Developing descriptions of skills

How to do this

• Leave room for individualization. Wrap is funded and administered different in each state
• Detailed but flexible - state to state not easy but it would be very helpful
• Perhaps after the descriptions were created it could roll into some good interviewing questions that would help agencies to hire the right staff
• YES. NWI has national credibility. It assures that knowledgable people from a variety of communities have worked together to develop the product. When new communities are working hard to effect change, it is helpful for them to be able to reference and use work created at the NWI level.
• To do this right we need good definitions of fundamentals: what is a need? Define a set of sentence templates to help facilitators talk about and document needs (as distinct from services). Same goes for vision statements, strengths, strategies, and the concept of normalization. In order for skills to be effectively applied we need precision regarding a "data dictionary" for the fundamentals of WA.
• Might force us to get clear about skills as the next step in development. We seem to have some consensus on activities for different roles, but we have not done well in articulating skills behind these activities.
• One of my frustrations has been the lack of this information from the NWI. Communities should not need to build this on their own
• Take to the next level - free or low cost; access to e-learning tools or curriculum
• Need to be empirically based - We should think about testing what we've developed in as many ways as possible
• To "do it right" getting input from a cross section of the people in the key roles would be essential in large enough numbers to matter
Developing descriptions of skills

Draw on existing resources

- Choices TA Center, has a "Hiring Strategies for Your System of Care" that lists not only knowledge and skills (these can be taught) but also talents (that are personality traits).
- It might look a bit like the process Pat Miles uses in her Directive Supervision approach, first defining Universal Skills and then articulating specifics included in those Universal Skills.
- Base the work off the skill sets already developed and in place for current certification such as Vroon VanDenBerghs and others.
- Define essential skills based on what is necessary for each phase per job (parent partner, facilitator, supervisor, etc). Help write job descriptions based on these skill sets. Ensure good ways to monitor or provide helpful feedback on each skill set. Pat Miles Directive Supervision is a good example.
- I think the VVDB skill sets are good and the Emq-Fpi has also developed skill sets. I think it would be good to collect skill sets for Wraparound from as many sources as possible and make them available to programs, agencies, and governmental agencies providing Wraparound.
- I think that the Parent’s Anonymous/UC Davis project for Parent Partners has done a phenomenal job with describing essential skills for key roles. If this model were expanded to the other roles, I would use it.

Concerns

- the problem is even if you create them, too few people currently in the workforce will actually possess them - would really have to focus on how to train and coach the work force to adhere to the wraparound model.
- Again, I think this can be a really good thing. However I get concerned that there are those out there that think there is only ONE way to implement the principles.
- Some skills are definable and some talents are not. It’s hard to describe honesty, openness, respect, compassion, and empathy.
People have suggested that the NWI should develop expectations for--and tools to support--supervision of key roles in wraparound. Do you think it would be a good idea for the NWI to do this?
Expectations and Tools for Supervision

Feedback on how

- Develop with experienced family members and trained by family members who have firsthand experience.
- The tools and expectations need to be rooted in the real world not in the perfect world. We all have challenges of time and money, so NWI would need to take this into consideration.
- Tools would need to be accessible, affordable, and sustainable for communities.
- Should include standards for supervision and specific "how to's" in coaching and supervising to the model.
- Creation of functional performance evaluations which can be used and trained to and beyond the practitioner level which can become teaching tools at the administrative and management levels; online training modules to address both skills and the values which must support the work.
- Many supervisors would appreciate tools to help guide them in the supervision process of their Wraparound program.
- The most important role in wraparound is the supervisor. Whatever support we can give this person the better. Tools must be integrated into the management information system, easy to use and worth the time it will take for the supervisor to learn.
- 1) Supervisors should be required to become certified in WFAS and to participate in some aspect of WFAS for about 2 weeks each year with their agency. 2) Supervisors should be required to take a few days of standard, nationally-sanctioned training each year. 3) Supervisors should be evaluated by their staff on how well they coach direct report staff.
- A great model of supervision which lends itself well to the Wraparound approach is "Solution Focused Supervision". This model has been very helpful in developing Supervisor to be effective and strength based.
Expectations and Tools for Supervision

More feedback on how
  • Some form of mentoring or follow along capacity would be useful, particularly because often supervisors have no training or history with wraparound.
  • If we developed some consensus and then tested the ideas before generating tools that's a different and necessary improvement to NWI process

Building on existing resources
  • I would like to see some discovery of what has already been done before starting something new. I think there are several folks that have spent a lot of time in this area so gathering of current information would be great.
  • I like the model VVDB uses. There needs to be oversight of the documentation and the practical skills used in order to prevent model drift.
  • Again, I'd look at Pat's Directive Supervision approach.

Concerns
  • I think tools can always be useful as long as they remain viewed as possible options to strengthen the supervision process. I worry when the tool becomes a mandate or a non-negotiable.
  • The NWI should not be involved in dictating the supervision of key roles in Wraparound. This should be the responsibility of each agency, group, etc., and based upon their mission and purpose.
People have suggested that the NWI should work to create a more sustainable and interactive "community of practice" to support sharing and peer-to-peer support at the individual and/or community level.
Community of Practice

- More formalization of the NWI might be beneficial
- Would be more effective for states and regions to develop communities of support
- NWI should, through its advisors, provide leadership and ideas for developing communities of practice at state, regional and national levels.
- Interactive webinars; the conference idea could be another way to support this although it's not always easy for communities to get to conferences
- Multiple forums for interaction in order to support folks who learn and relate via different formats.
- Set up a virtual network for practitioners to share ideas and cultivate new thinking. A CoP could be an incubator for integrating principles from other change paradigms, such as Appreciative Inquiry and Motivational Interviewing, into WA practice.
- This would go a long way to creating a system wide change on a large scale.
- Possibly a running list of agencies and their program descriptions and wraparound efforts on the NWI website.
Community of Practice

More feedback

- Align and support the work of family organizations. Use them as the vehicle to support the community of practice. Parents and parent organizations ARE the community you are trying to reach and have access to the professionals who are trying to retrain and guide.

- Web-based strategies would be most practical offering a range of degrees of participation such as: browsing the NWI website; receiving an e-newsletter quarterly; being invited to participate in webinars for training on specific tools or concepts; virtual conversations to discuss issues; interactive seminars to explore key issues and identify effective solutions.

- People want to talk to other people doing the work. A community of practice would have an extensive national contact list that is up to date, information regarding trainings/conferences disseminated quickly, regular meetings per discipline/role, information provided on WA advocacy for policy development in respective states, input into the NWI, and a fabulous web cite.

Concerns

- ?? who has time!
- The challenge of course is for those in the communities to carve out the time to participate.
Tools to Evaluate Training

People have suggested that the NWI should develop tools and or a process for assessing the quality or impact of training and consulting…
Tools to evaluate training/TA

Feedback

- Make sure families are asked about their experiences. Accuracy does not always come from the provider.
- I think it could be pretty simple. Providers and others in the community who participate in the training could be contacted for feedback. I don’t think written evaluations directly following trainings or consultation tend to be as accurate as feedback given after there has been time to digest the information or assess the impact.
- Great idea to have a module that would also instruct and create guidelines for trainers and consultants to help create like a "standard of care" for training. As a consultant I welcome this and would be happy to contribute to this workgroup. It could begin by creating a good outcome measure/ training evaluation tool that could be applied to many training topics.
- To have a way to access all the information about trainers and consultants so that one can be chosen that recognizes the culture of their agency and community would be beneficial.
- We have found with W.R.A.P. pre and post surveys are helpful along with follow-up mini trainings or consults to assist in the problem solving and implementation of Wraparound.
- Provide opportunities for the consultees to give feedback to the consultants.
Tools to evaluate training/TA

Concerns
• Time consuming. The "market" should assess quality and value of training and consulting through feedback and contracting.
• Consultants should develop their own tools/processes for helping clients determine whether or not they've gotten their money's worth
• Alternatives
  • Although I think evaluation is the responsibility of the agency, community or state to oversee, it would be good for folks to know how to pick training consultants. It might be best to have consultants list training they have done with regard to wraparound and all training they have preformed that training with contact information and then sites can call and match based on that.
  • After just developing a training based on all that I have learned, I already believe that it needs tweaking, it would be nice to have a "national" group of trainers that could meet periodically and discuss...change or evolution.
  • Would it be feasible to use the WFI tools to see if there has been an increase in fidelity after consultation and training?
Comparison...

Conferences

Certify Individuals

Certify Orgs

Skill Sets

Tools for Sup.

Comm. of Practice

Tools to Evaluate
Training
Day 1: Small group work

- For each priority area please identify
  - What would be the most useful outputs that could be produced in this area?
    - Use the feedback from the survey and group discussion to characterize what it would take for these outputs to be “done right”
  - What could be done in the next year to make progress on creating these outputs?
  - What are the first steps? Formulate the beginnings of an action plan.
Wednesday Agenda

• Recap of day 1
• Panel and discussion:
  - Priorities for the NWI
• Task groups and continuation of yesterday’s small group work
• BREAK
• Summary of goals and priorities for next year and beyond!
• Next steps and wrap-up
NWI Work groups

- Goals
- Action steps
- By whom?
- By when?